

3/5/63

Viewpoint. R. More.
Good Evening, Winston Churchill

has recently announced
that he will not stand
for Parliament again.

This has been taken
as a symbol of the passing
of an era in the history
of the British Parliament
and the British People.

Of course from many
corners of the world

there have been tributes
and expressions of gratitude
to the great statesman
and parliamentarian.

Obviously Churchill has
his ardent fans; it is
equally obvious that
he has his violent
detractors.

What has always inter-
ested me about him is
not so much his virtues

or vice: I am intrigued by
the paradox of his historical
vision.

You must have heard
it frequently said that
Churchill has a deep sense
of history. What this
means is that Churchill
was able to understand
and interpret more accurately
than most statesmen the
things that were happening

around him. Certainly when
you look at his attitude
to the Nazis and the Fascists
in the 1930's you realise
one thing: that he was
probably alone in Britain
in understanding what sort
of threat Hitler and Mussol-
ini posed. When Churchill
told the English nation to
arm - because only by meeting
Hitler with equal strength

would they quell his ambitions -
most Englishmen dismissed
him as a warmonger. He
turned out to be right.

But there was another
15. in which he showed
contemporaries to be
short-sighted. A large
number of top-people in
Britain felt that Hitler and
Mussolini ought to be encouraged.
They argued, you see, that

these two men were such
haters of Communism that
that they could safely
be trusted to wipe it out
and Russia too - and wipe
themselves out in the process.

Churchill would have
none of this. He felt that
the Nazis and the Fascists
simply would not do Britain
and France's dirty work for
them. He warned them

that to expect Hitler to attack
a Russia that at least had
some protection in the Red
Army. Surely, he said, Hitler
would attack those countries
like Britain and France
which had very little protection.

Events showed Churchill
to be right in both instances.
His sense of history seemed
to be vindicated. But it
is precisely here that

the Paradise crises. Churchill
who saw so much that was
correct when it came to events
in Europe, could not see
one thing that lesser men
saw: that is, that the days
of the British Empire -
indeed of all colonial Empires
were numbered. He said
once during the war, when
the question of Indian
Independence came up "

"I was not made P.M. to
preside over the liquidation
of the British Empire." And
had he been in office in
1947 the struggle for Indian
independence might have
been ~~more bitter and more~~
a matter of "blood, sweat
and tears." What is ironic
here is that many of
his fellow politicians in the
1930's felt a war with

who had little sense of history

once said " If won I lose

this war, Britain and France

can't win because they will

lose their empires." He did

lose the war. But Britain

France and all the other

imperial countries have also

lost their empires. And so

you have the paradox of

a man with a deep sense

of history going blind on

~~Hitler~~
~~Hitler~~ because they knew
that their Empire would
fall as a result. Churchill
looked upon War not
as a means of
destroying Nazism but
as a way of preserving
Democracy and Empire.
With all his sense of
huxory he went wrong on
the subject of Empire.
On the other hand Hitler

or perhaps the most monumental
political change of the modern
world - and a man with no
sense of history being dead
right. In this case it is
Hester who has had the
last laugh on Churchill.